

App. No. 10/506,363  
Office Action Dated October 3, 2005

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 are hereby amended.

Amendment of claim 1 is supported by the subject matter of claim 2. Amendments of claims 4, 7, and 8 are supported by Figure 1. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are amended editorially.

Claims 1-4 and 9-11 were rejected as being anticipated by Yoshikawa (US 5,751,464). Applicants traverse this rejection. In view of the Examiner's comments, it seems that claim 7 should have been included in this rejection. In any case, Yoshikawa does not disclose an optical scanner wherein a light beam from a light source part, after being reflected from an optical deflector, is reflected from a second reflecting optical element, then is reflected from a first reflecting optical element, and further is reflected from the second reflecting optical element, as required by claim 1. Rather, Yoshikawa discloses an apparatus where a light beam from a semiconductor laser (1) is reflected by a polygon mirror (5, rejection equates to the claimed optical deflector), then is reflected by a first curved mirror (7, rejection equates to the claimed first reflecting optical element), and then is reflected by a second curved mirror (8, rejection equates to the claimed second reflecting optical element). Neither the first nor second curved mirror (7, 8) reflects the light beam both before and after the light beam is reflected off of the other of the first and second curved mirrors (7, 8), as required by claim 1. In fact, a light beam reflected from the first curved mirror (7) is further reflected off of the second curved mirror (8) and is then incident on the surface to be scanned (9), without being reflected again from the first curved mirror (7). See Figure 1.

In contrast, the optical scanner configuration of claim 1 more efficiently uses space and therefore provides a small-sized image forming apparatus (see page 3, lines 17-18).

Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-4, 7, and 9-11 is requested.

App. No. 10/506,363  
Office Action Dated October 3, 2005

Claim 8 was rejected as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Nakaie (US 6,049,409). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 8 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Nakaie does not remedy the deficiencies of Yoshikawa, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to claim 8. Favorable reconsideration of claim 8 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Dated: December 29, 2005



DPM:mfe

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Douglas P. Mueller", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No.: 30,300  
Haire, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2650  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612.455.3800